"I'll google it.": Using an Online Dictionary for Conducting Repair during Pair and Group Work Activities in Upper-Secondary EFL Classrooms

Adéla Červenková

ABSTRACT:

Pair and group work activities break the traditional teacher-centred structures of interaction and partly transfer the control of the teacher to the students, who are provided with more freedom in turn-taking and the management of activities. In the study of how students learn the target language, pair and group work repair sequences are particularly important in order to understand how the participants repair the breakdowns in communication and what processes for acquiring a foreign language they use. This study explores the different ways that students conduct conversational repair, i.e. negotiation of meaning, during pair and group work. Specifically, focusing on the sequences when a dictionary was consulted, this conversation-analytic study examines how the students incorporate the dictionary in those sequences and how its possible presence might influence the roles of experts and novices in the interaction, which gives insight into the epistemic dynamics in learner–learner interactions. The data used for this study consist of carefully synchronized audio and video recordings of students from five different Czech upper-secondary schools in their final year of studies during three to five consecutive EFL lessons. One of the central findings is that the students often try to conduct the repair through different means and the dictionary is used later in the interaction, which could indicate that the use of a dictionary is viewed as a last resort to check the meaning with the dictionary entry, as well as a tool to strengthen and/or weaken the epistemic roles of the participants.

KEY WORDS

conversation analysis, pair and group work, repair, negotiating meaning, online dictionary, epistemics, expert, novice

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study explores a specific aspect of pair and group work interaction — using an online dictionary for negotiating meaning in repair sequences. It contributes to existing international research focused on using a dictionary and other language tools in learner–learner interaction, as seen in, for example, Barrow (2010), Reichert and Liebscher (2012) and Stone (2019). The conversation-analytic research of pair and group work interaction in language learning in the Czech educational context is rather limited (Tůma et al., 2019). By analysing the different means of incorporating the dictionary into the interaction and the ways in which the findings are shared in the groups, this research gives an insight into how students learn language in pair and group activities and, consequently, sheds light on the teaching implications when it comes to allowing language tools in EFL classrooms.

In every interaction the participants negotiate the meaning of the dialogue in order to avoid and, if necessary, to overcome any problems in communication, and to ensure that both the speaker and the listener are able to understand each other. Language is then used to conduct those interactions in various settings and modalities of production and understanding. Whether it is institutional talk or mundane conversation, every interaction is orderly and follows a certain structure and rules. Institutional dialogue is defined by its participants who perform the roles of either the professional members of the institution (such as a court, hospital, school, etc.) or its clients (such as the citizens, patients, students, etc.). In the form of talk-in-interaction, the focus is on "how specific practices of talk embody or connect with specific identities and institutional tasks" (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, pp. 16–17). The institutionality of a dialogue is negotiated by its participants and their relationship with the institutional roles and identities, as well as through their management of the tasks and activities relevant to the institution.

Classroom interaction is a form of institutional talk showing distinctive characteristics in the "distribution of knowledge, access to conversational resources, and to participation in the interaction", as described by Drew and Heritage (1992, p. 49). In teacher-centred classrooms, the interactions tend to be heavily influenced by the teacher, who has greater rights to initiate and close sequences, as well as monitor the turn allocation and sequence organization (McHoul, 1978, pp. 184–185). Pair and group work then break the traditional teacher-centred structures of interaction and partly transfer the control of the teacher to the students, who are provided with more freedom in turn-taking allocation and the management of the activities. The difference in their proficiency allows the students to have a positive impact on each other's language development as they can provide scaffolded assistance to each other (Dobao, 2012). The distance between the current level of development and the potential level that can be reached with the help of a more knowledgeable other has been described as the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky states that individuals can learn from one another as knowledge is co-constructed and the learner then might reach higher levels of knowledge if provided with help and resources. During pair and group work activities, the learners can thus learn from each other and achieve more together than as individuals, specifically in repair sequences.

Repair was first defined by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) as speakers' dealing with a problem in hearing, speaking and understanding. In their research, they distinguished between four major types of repair based on who the initiator and conductor is — self-initiated repair, other-initiated repair, self-repair and other repair. They investigated the organization of repair, the usual place where it is initiated and conducted, and revealed a strong preference for self-repair in ordinary conversation. McHoul (1990) then shifted his focus to the organization of repair sequences in classroom interaction, which inevitably follows the rules of turn-taking in institutional dialogue, given its setting. His findings showed the difference in frequency of occurrence of the various types of repair, revealing that other repair appears fairly often with the teacher correcting the students' talk. Markee (2000) focused on the organization of repair in equal and unequal power speech exchange systems, thus differentiating between repair in frontal teaching and pair and group work interactions.

The roles of initiators and conductors often change given the distribution of knowledge, or rather the lack thereof. The understanding of what is mutually known and what might be unknown to the speakers, as studied in epistemics, is fundamental for maintaining interaction and being able to recognizably refer to people, places and things (Heritage, 2012). For example, by initiating a repair sequence, the speaker makes their unknowing public to other participants, who either conduct the repair and thus express their knowing, or move the responsibility forward.

Every repair is a triadic sequence and consists of three fundamental elements — trouble source, initiation and correction (McHoul, 1990). The trouble source might be understood as anything that somehow breaks the flow of the conversation. Depending on the position of the trouble source when it is recognized, Schegloff (1979) distinguishes between backward-oriented repair, which might occur during negotiation of meaning with the trouble source being identified in prior talk; and forward-oriented repair, in which the trouble source is yet to be produced, as might happen in word-search sequences. Concentrating on the classroom context, a distinction can be made between didactic repair, regarding form and accuracy, and conversational repair, concentrating on meaning and fluency (Van Lier, 1988; Seedhouse, 2004). Didactic repair might appear in interactions that include, for instance, grammatical errors, incorrect pronunciation or word-search sequences. Conversational repair then occurs when "comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation checks, verifications of meaning, definition requests" (Markee, 2000, p. 84) are needed in order to continue the interaction. In this study, conversational repair for negotiating meaning is analysed.

Pair and group work repair sequences are particularly important for language acquisition researchers in order to understand how the participants repair breakdowns in communication, as well as any misunderstandings. By being identified and turned into an object of learning by the students themselves, the trouble source functions as a learnable, which is defined as "whatever is interactively established as relevant and developed into a shared pedagogical focus" (Majlesi & Broth 2012, p. 193). The transformation of knowledge within a peer group shows the importance of epistemic stances in learner–learner interaction as it does not have previously institutionalized roles to rely on (Melander, 2012). As a result, the identities of knowing and unknowing speakers are under constant negotiation and are either supported or challenged within the group throughout the whole interaction.

Various ways in which the identities of experts and novices are enacted by the learners might be explored within interaction. The institutional roles are not fixed during peer interaction. In fact, Reichert and Liebscher (2012) go so far as to state that the model of expert–novice is unrealistic in learner–learner interaction, as the person offering a solution for the given lexical problem may not be immediately treated as an expert. The learners may demand additional authority to support the solution. Often the presence of dictionaries and other language tools in the interaction is of great influence, as they are seen as an authoritative source of knowledge and their expertise is no longer challenged by the participants (*ibid.*). In other instances, the authority is represented by the knowledge of another language that helps in the negotiation of meaning.

Furthermore, in repair sequences during pair and group work activities, the learners might code-switch, especially during the initiations and closings of repair sequences (Mori, 2004). Different ways of using L1 to solve problems and to create understanding can be explored in repair sequences. The participants may rely on L1 when managing sequential boundaries while interacting with each other. Facing problems in mutual understanding, the students deal with them as problems of interaction, hence the use of L1. If the students are allowed to use L1 anytime they want, repair in the classroom then might be viewed as a pedagogical tool and a resource for modified output, as well as input. Code-switching in repair also reduces the time spent on the negotiation of meaning and thus allows students to move to the institutional work faster. Moreover, code-switching is not always an indicator of insufficient L2 knowledge. In fact, repair is not interpreted as a request for code-switching unless the repair initiation is a code-switch itself (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2003). Once the teacher joins the interaction, a noticeable switch to L2 could follow (Mori, 2004). Often, however, the code-switch back to L2 might cause more problems and increase the number of steps needed for finding appropriate expressions. If the institutional classroom talk is kept strictly in L2, the learners can view repair as a central practice of the interaction between them (Lehti-Eklund, 2013). Therefore, conversational repair in institutional dialogue can be viewed as a role-defining mechanism for classroom interaction and different uses of the repair by the learners and the teacher are worth examining (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2003).

As Tůma, Fořtová and Nepivodová (2019) remark in their review study, the conversation-analytic research of pair and group work interaction in language learning in the context of Czech schools is rather limited and the majority of analyses of peer interaction come from studies in other countries. The aim of the present study is to enlarge the already existing literature focusing on pair and group work interaction, specifically peer repair sequences, and give an insight into the current situation of language learning in Czech schools. Focusing on the repair conducted by using a dictionary, the analysis examines how the students incorporate the dictionary into those sequences and how the possible presence of the language tool might influence the roles of experts and novices in the interaction.

2. DATA AND METHOD

The data used for this study consist of audio and video recordings which were collected during October–December 2018 after all participants, including the teachers and the students, had signed an informed consent form. The participants include students from five different Czech upper-secondary schools in their final year of studies (between B1 and B2 level) during three to five consecutive EFL lessons. Since the focus of the research was pair and group work interaction, apart from the video recording of the whole classroom, the data include recordings of the specific pairs and groups from voice recorders, which were placed on the desks of the students. In total, 1585 minutes of video recordings and 2729 minutes of audio recordings were made and carefully synchronized. The recordings were transcribed using transcription

notations from the transcription system created by Gail Jefferson (2004), with additional notes from Klára Vaníčková (2014) (see Appendix 1).

For the purposes of this research, conversation analysis (CA) is used (for introductory texts see, for example, ten Have, 2007; Pomerantz & Fehr, 2011; Kasper & Wagner, 2014). Researchers using CA study social interaction and its organization in order to demonstrate that human production of routine conduct is methodical and orderly. Apart from analysing mundane conversation, CA is also used to analyse institutional talk. The current research on classroom interaction is generally focused on turn-taking, sequence organization and repair (Gardner, 2013). The structure of the interaction is inevitably connected to the pedagogical aim of each activity and sequence (Seedhouse, 2004) and thus a wide variety of different interaction patterns might be examined, whether it is in a whole-class activity or pair and group work. In the data used for this study, all excerpts come from communicative activities focused on fluency (the ability to speak smoothly) rather than accuracy (the ability to speak without mistakes). When reviewing and analysing the data, special attention was paid to the participants' perspectives (Pomerantz & Fehr, 2011) and how they accomplished the repair sequences within the speaking tasks at hand (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). The order of talk-in-interactions (ten Have, 2007) was analysed, as well as the actions that the speakers perform and the conducting practices they use to achieve them. The actions done in one turn have implications for and influence the response to it (Schegloff, 2007). Moreover, through each turn, the speakers display an understanding of a prior turn (Sidnell, 2013).

In repair sequences' initiation, apart from obvious questions and requests, the recipient must be able to recognize other features, such as pauses, hesitation sounds, repetitions etc., as practices that are meant to accomplish a repair initiation and, then, to check whether their understanding of it is accurate. The following turn of the recipient can then be taken as evidence of the initiator's struggles and their orientation in the interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

After carefully reading through the transcripts, I identified 45 sequences of conversational repair, i.e. sequences in which the learners in pair and group work activities negotiated the meaning of words that they marked as unknown or problematic. In the data it was common for the students to use different strategies for conducting repair, such as using L1, using L2, consulting a dictionary, asking the teacher for help, and skipping the problematic expression. Altogether, six sequences with the use of an online dictionary were identified and analysed in detail to answer the research question: How do students use an online dictionary to conduct repair in pair and group work activities? The ways in which the learners related to the dictionaries during repair sequences will be illustrated in three excerpts.

3. RESULTS AND ANALYSES

This section will present the findings of the analysis of the data, in which the speakers identified a mutually unknown phrase as a trouble source and tried to negotiate its meaning by initiating and conducting a repair sequence.

Excerpt 1 comes from an activity aimed at the revision of vocabulary and phrases from a reading which was done in the previous lesson. The students were given cards with the phrases. After shuffling the vocabulary cards among themselves, the students' task was to recreate a story about a businessman. In the excerpt the students encounter a problem with the meaning and pronunciation of the word "serrated" when S1 is unable to create a sentence with it and moves the card to the middle of the desk for others to see. After failing to conduct the repair by other means, the students opt to consult a dictionary.

Excerpt 1 (Gymn2hod2K1D4)

1   S1: what's a /se'rateɪtɪd/ (.) a knife? ((looks at Ss, confused))
2   S2: ((looks at the card)) I don't know=
3   S1: =I don't know either ((looks at S3))
4   S2: /se'rateɪtɪd/=
5   S3: =°serrated°
6   ((S3 looks for definition, S1 and S2 wait for response looking at S3))
7   S3: oh: like ozubený nůž= ((reads Czech translation from dic))
8   S1: =oh:=
9   S2: =oh:=
10 S1: =so he: used /se'rateɪtɪd/ knife to cut his bagels
11 ((Ss laugh))

In line 1, after reading her vocabulary card ("serrated") S1 straightforwardly asks what a serrated knife is. Her question relates to the meaning of the word, which together with the wrong pronunciation, a pause and her somewhat confused expression might suggest she does not know the word and identifies it as a trouble source for the following sequence. By looking at her colleagues and thus creating a transition relevance place to allow a new speaker to take their turn (McHoul, 1978), S1 initiates a repair sequence. The initiation is supported by S2 in line 2. After S1's mispronunciation of the word, S2 looks at the card to check he understood his colleague correctly. He then utters "I don't know", which might be interpreted as his claim of insufficient knowledge (Sert & Walsh, 2013), his way of refusing to accept the role of a knowing participant in the interaction and avoiding the responsibility of conducting the repair. As Heritage and Clayman (2010) point out, the epistemic roles are clearly distributed in any interaction that includes a question, with the questioner taking on the identity of an unknowing speaker and the answerer the role of a knowing speaker.

In line 3, S1 reacts to S2 by expressing that she does not understand the phrase and, hence, she emphasizes her lack of knowledge again. Initiating eye contact with a different student, S1 allocates the next turn to her colleague and waits to get her answer, which puts S3 immediately into the position of an expert, supported by S1's and S2's continuous verbal expression of the lack of knowledge, as well as their multiple mispronunciations of the problematic word. Therefore, in line 5, S3 is expected to start to conduct the repair. Before doing so, she actually pronounces the word correctly, despite the earlier mistake of her colleagues, which only strengthens her position of

an expert, even though it might serve as an error correction, too. S3 has easy access to an online dictionary as her phone lies next to her on the desk throughout the whole sequence. In fact, S3 does not even try to conduct the repair in any other way. Instead, in line 6, she immediately reaches for her phone and looks for the definition. While doing so, S1 and S2 look at their colleague and wait for her findings, which might indicate that they respect the authority of the language tool and the epistemic power it gives S3 (Reichert & Liebscher, 2012). Moreover, S3's access to the dictionary is the group's shared knowledge, since the phone is visible to all of them, suggesting that S3 might take the role of an expert in other instances as well by continuously consulting the dictionary.

In line 7, S3 conducts the repair. She accompanies the Czech translation of the word with a prolonged interjection of "oh", which, according to Heritage (1984), functions as a change-of-state token[1] revealing its producer's change of knowledge. Both S1 and S2 then react in the same manner, indicating the meaning of the phrase is now clear (line 8, 9). As Melander (2012, p. 239) states, the token occurs "at points at which the informings are possibly complete" and, thus, lines 8 and 9 might be interpreted as a closure of the repair sequence. Moreover, in line 10, the initiator, S1, further proves the repair has been conducted successfully by going back to the initial activity and retelling the story with the correct use of the word in context, suggesting the meaning has been conveyed. Nevertheless, she yet again mispronounces "serrated", which could further prove that the focus of the repair was to negotiate the meaning. Later in the activity (not shown in the transcript), the teacher encourages the students to note down any new expressions from the vocabulary cards. S1 immediately utters the initial trouble source "serrated", which might indicate that she remembered the word and the repair sequence could have helped her to learn it.

Excerpt 1 shows a self-initiated other repair, conducted by consulting a dictionary and using a translation of the word. As Wei (2002, p. 164) puts it: "whatever language a participant chooses for the organisation of his/her turn, or for an utterance which is part of the turn, the choice exerts an influence on subsequent language choices by the same or other speakers". Since Czech was used only for translating the problematic expression, the code-switching did not influence the preceding nor following turns and, therefore, the rest of the sequence was conducted in English. As the trouble source was the meaning, S3 used an online dictionary to look for the definition and/or translation and not for the correct pronunciation of the seemingly new word, hence the repeated mistake of S1, the initiator of the repair (line 9), and S2 (line 4) in pronouncing "serrated".

In this sequence S3 appears as an expert among her peers. As Melander (2012, p. 234) points out, "the participants are not simply categorized with regard to their epistemic states, but they are ordered relative to each other where the identities of the separate participants are tied to each other rather than separate". This seems to be applicable to this interaction. At first, the role of a language authority is assigned

---

1 A change-of-state token is used to acknowledge that its speaker has gone through some kind of change in their knowledge in that particular part of a sequence. It is most commonly expressed by the interjection "oh" (Heritage, 1984).

to S3 when S1 and S2 both admit to their lack of knowledge and turn their attention to their partner (line 3). In line 5, S3 correctly pronounces the problematic expression, which can be seen as her accepting the role of a knowing expert. However, her position as an expert is strengthened by more than her knowledge of the target language. Reichert and Liebscher (2012, p. 607) claim that "of importance are other kinds of expertise, and the ways in which interactants display and accept them". In their analysis they include the use of dictionaries and textbooks as means of negotiating the expert/novice roles in peer interactions, which is also evident in Excerpt 1. S3's role of an expert is supported by her having access to an online dictionary and, hence, to the knowledge, since after she shares the translation of the word, her authority is not questioned, and the students continue with their task.

The importance of the authority of the language tool is also shown in the following excerpt. While in Excerpt 1, the presence of a dictionary is known to all participants and thus leads to them immediately using it to conduct the repair sequence, in Excerpt 2 the dictionary is used together with other resources to conduct the repair. In the following excerpt the activity is focused on business. The students, divided into pairs, are given a set of vocabulary cards related to starting a business. Their task is to put the cards in order to create a list of necessary steps when starting a company. In the sequence, the students encounter a problem with the phrase "to merge with" on one of the cards.

Excerpt 2 (Gymn2hod3K1D1)

1　S1: merge with it? ((looks at phone))
2　((S2 looks at S1))
3　S2: it's like (.) to::: ((gestures)) be together with someone
4　S1: mhm ((keeps looking at phone))
5　S2: like two companies become one= ((S1 looks up from phone))
6　S1: =okay=
7　S2: =I would say (.) I'm not sure=
8　S1: =yeah
9　S2: I don't know
10　S1: and then to hire staff

The students encounter a problem when S1 looks at a card with the expression "merge with". She reads it and her slightly rising intonation together with the correct pronunciation indicate the trouble source is the meaning of the phrase. By using rising intonation at the end of her turn (line 1) she initiates the repair sequence. She then grabs her phone and starts manipulating it, possibly looking for the definition and/or translation of the problematic word. In line 2, S2 tries to initiate eye contact with S1 indicating that he might have interpreted the pause at the end of S1's turn and her rising intonation as a place for the transition of the speakers. Even though S2 fails to establish mutual gaze, in line 3 he starts to conduct the repair by giving his explanation in English. This could suggest that he interpreted line 1 as the initiation of a repair and, consequently, began conducting it.

In line 3, while conducting the repair, S2 uses a filler ("like"), pauses and a prolonged vowel ("to:::") accompanied by hand gestures, which might indicate that he is trying to attract the attention of his colleague, who continues looking at her phone, even though in line 4 she responds with an affirmative sound ("mhm"). Nevertheless, it is not clear whether it is a reaction to her colleague or to her findings. This prompts S2 to develop his explanation a bit more in line 5. When S1 finally looks up from her phone, she does not look at her partner; instead, she goes back to look at the pile of vocabulary cards on the desk. Her response ("okay") in line 6 can then be analysed as a neutral sequence-closing third (Schegloff, 2007).[2] Because of the lack of video evidence, it is not clear whether S1 found that the translation in the dictionary corresponded with S1's explanation or that she was not successful in finding the translation and as a result could not challenge her colleague's explanation further. However, the ambiguity of S1's response makes S2 start to express doubts about his previous answers by saying that he is not sure (line 7). By belittling the validity of his explanation, he might be expressing his lack of confidence to take the responsibility of being a language authority alongside his colleague, who has access to a language tool. In line 8, S1 recognizes her partner's hesitation. She opts for another neutral sequence-closing third ("yeah") in line 8, which suggests the repair sequence is closed for good. In line 9, S2 again mentions that he does not know. At this point in the sequence, S2 may not be referring to his lack of knowledge concerning the trouble source. Instead it could be analysed as him accepting that the repair sequence is closed by distancing himself from being the language authority. In line 10, S1 goes back to the initial activity and continues to put the vocabulary cards in the correct order. She suggests a card that could follow the trouble source "merge with", which indicates that the meaning was successfully conveyed and that she, as an initiator of the repair sequence, understands the phrase in the context of the activity.

Excerpt 2 includes a self-initiated other repair, even though it seems as if S1, the initiator, is going to try to self-repair after consulting a dictionary. S2 then opts to conduct the repair in L2 by giving an explanation. However, he weakens his statement by using a modal verb and "I'm not sure" as an epistemic stance marker (Biber et al., 1999), expressing his uncertainty and lack of confidence, which may have resulted from the presence of the dictionary in the interaction. Even though S2 is put into the position of an expert by S1, who initiates the repair, asks for help and thus expresses her unknowing, as well as by conducting the repair himself in line 3, the roles switch immediately the moment S1 takes her phone and gains access to the knowledge through an online dictionary. As Reichert and Liebscher (2012, p. 603) observe, the students "do not automatically treat the speaker who offers a solution (…) as the more knowledgeable participant". This can also be seen in Excerpt 2, when S2 weakens his statement, even though, being the conductor of the repair, he had started the interaction in the role of a knowing participant. His position of an expert is challenged by S1's access to a dictionary, which, in this peer activity, seems to serve

---

2   A sequence-closing third is a minimal expansion after the second turn and is designed to propose the closing of a sequence. It may be formed in different ways, most common being "oh", "okay" and assessments (Schegloff, 2007).

as a language authority, similarly to the teacher in teacher–student interactions. Furthermore, S1's ambiguous response after consulting the dictionary also weakens her expertise. Instead of supporting or challenging S2's explanation of the trouble source, she opts to close the sequence. This is further evidence that the epistemic roles in pair and group-work activities are under constant negotiation.

When conducting repair the students usually employ different ways of finding a solution. As can be seen in Excerpt 2, both the use of a dictionary and L2 explanation play important roles in conveying the correct meaning, which shows that in pair and group work interactions the students often demand additional resources to accept each other's expertise (Reichert & Liebscher, 2012). Similarly, in Excerpt 3, the dictionary enters the sequence after the failure of initial attempts to convey the meaning through different means. The following excerpt comes from the activity of retelling the story of a bagel businessman. The students shuffle the vocabulary cards among themselves and start the activity. In this sequence, the students encounter a lexical problem with the word "recoup" in one of the cards.

Excerpt 3 (Gymn2hod2K1D3)

```
 1   S1: I'm not sure what my (.) last sentence mean=
 2   S2: =me neither=
 3   S3: =I'm not sure ((Ss laugh and show each other their cards))
 4   S4: okay (.) I know it that again (..) he made the test (.) and
 5       (xxxxx) (.) he had to (.) give the bagels (.) ehm (.) he then
 6       get paid (..) paid for old bagel ((mumbles, looks around group))=
 7   S3: =mhm ((hesitantly))
 8   S1: yes (.) ehm
 9   S2: ehm:::: (.) he discovered- ((Ss look at the card, confused))
10   S4: I'll google it=
11   S1: =the underpayment to oversight co to je ((laughs))=
                                          what is it
12   S2: =maybe it's like that (.) you (.) you jakože přepisovat (.)
                                          like to rewrite
13       like you:: e::: (.) think of it oversight causes=
14   S4: =recoup is kompenzovat=
                to compensate
15   S1: =kompenzovat a::: (.) kompenzovat náklady (.) for sure=
           to compensate        to compensate costs
16   S2: =so to (..) well the cash basket was to recoup the costs=
17   S1: =yeah so the kompenzovat náklady was the cash basket=
                        to compensate costs
18   S4: =£ty tomu rozumíš£
            you understand this
19       (5)
20   S2: like (.) the oversight was causing the underpayment
```

The students encounter a lexical problem right at the beginning of the excerpt. In the first three lines, they admit that they are not sure about the meaning of the phrases on their cards. They all move the card to the middle of the desk to emphasize their struggles. In line 4, S4 begins to explain one of the given cards. However, since the video recording of this interaction was shot from afar, it is not entirely clear which card and phrase S4 refers to. Nevertheless, in line 14 of the interaction, it might be deduced that the trouble source is the meaning of the phrase "recoup the costs". After S1, S2 and S3 all express their lack of knowledge, as well as their inability to use their cards in the activity, S4 takes the floor and begins to incorporate her vocabulary card in retelling the story. Even though S4 confidently states that she knows what the phrase means ("I know it"), her rather significant use of pauses and hesitation sounds ("ehm", line 5) suggest that she has trouble expressing herself and conveying the correct meaning of the phrase. She looks around her group, which might further indicate that she is struggling to formulate an explanation on the spot, as well as suggest that she is initiating a repair sequence by trying to establish eye contact and allocate a different speaker. In line 7, S3 gives a positive affirmation with a "mhm" sound, which here could serve as a continuer[3] (Schegloff, 1982) to assure S4 that he is paying attention and to encourage the speaker to go on. Similarly, S2 then also reassures S4 that he is paying attention (line 8). However, the hesitation and confusion of all the students (line 9) that follows indicates that either they may not have understood S4's turn as an initiation of a repair or that they are reluctant to start conducting it. This prompts S4 in line 10 to begin a self-repair. This time, after her previous unsuccessful attempts to explain, she offers to find an explanation on the Internet. Since S1, S2 and S3 do not try to conduct the repair, S4 is the sole answerer in the group and, thus, becomes the expert — despite originally initiating the repair. Having access to an online dictionary strengthens her position as a knowing speaker.

In the following lines 11, 12 and 13, the speakers deal with a different lexical problem, which is not analysed here. Then in line 14, S4 interrupts S2 and shares her findings with the group using the Czech translation of the problematic expression. This interruption might suggest that S4 accepted the role of a knowing speaker and uses the authority given to her by having access to the dictionary to switch the attention back to her initial trouble source. She gets immediate feedback from S1, who validates her response with a prolonged interjection ("a:::", line 15). The interjection can be understood as a Czech version of "oh", the change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) to express a change in the knowledge of its speaker. S1 then repeats the translation and eventually even translates the whole phrase into L1 to further prove his understanding of it (line 15). By agreeing with S4 and reassuring her ("for sure"), he closes the repair sequence. In line 16, S2 then uses the phrase correctly and smoothly in the exercise, which then indicates that the meaning has been conveyed successfully. Even though he is interrupted by S1, who shows his agreement ("yeah") and yet again repeats the Czech translation in the sentence (line 17), S1's turn serves as a validation

---

3   A continuer serves as a token for the hearer to acknowledge their understanding and to encourage the speaker to continue their turn. It is most commonly expressed by "mhm", "hm" and "uh huh" sounds (Schegloff, 1982).

of both S2's use of the phrase and again S4's translation. However, given his mocking tone, he might not be taking the activity seriously and/or might be trying to lighten the mood. In line 18, S4 continues with the same intonation and sarcastically comments on S1's understanding of the phrase, which serves as a closing for this specific interaction. The longer pause that follows then allows the whole group to refocus on a different card from the activity, as supported by S2's turn in line 20.

This repair sequence is not clearly and straightforwardly initiated as in the majority of other instances in the analysis, given the lack of video evidence. Nevertheless, judging by the problems with expressing herself and an overall hesitation of S4 in her turn (lines 4–6), it might be interpreted as her initiation of the repair, which was further encouraged by the less than enthusiastic reaction of her colleagues (lines 7 and 8). As S4 is also the one who decides to conduct the repair by offering to look up the definition of the problematic expression, the sequence might be considered to be a self-initiated self-repair, which is then closed by S1 in line 15. The meaning was conveyed with the help of a dictionary and, consequently, the Czech translation of the word. The use of the language tool here yet again proves important for challenging and/or accepting the epistemic roles in the interaction. In Reichert and Liebscher's study (2012, p. 607), the students often "request an authoritative source of information", which occurs here in Excerpt 3 as well. The explanation by S4 is not accepted by her colleagues in the initial stages, which prompts her to take her phone and look up the translation in an online dictionary, after which her position as a knowing expert is not questioned anymore and her findings are accepted by all participants.

All three excerpts deal with conducting a repair sequence by consulting a dictionary. The language tool was often used as an additional source of knowledge when conveying a meaning. The influence of having access to a dictionary as an authoritative language source is important for negotiating epistemic roles within the interaction. Once the student shared the outcome of their dictionary search (Excerpts 1 and 3), the validity of their response was not challenged and instead the translation was immediately accepted. The reason for choosing to use a dictionary might also stem from the origin of the trouble source. In each excerpt it comes from the materials given by the teacher. The teacher is often the language authority in the classroom and the students could perhaps understand the importance of knowing the exact definition of the phrase assigned by the teacher should they need it later in the activity or lesson. Even though they identified the learnable themselves, the source of the materials might have encouraged them to seek a literal translation where a vaguer explanation would have otherwise sufficed. Other means of conducting the repair (such as using L1) accompanied the use of a dictionary, suggesting the students view it as a tool to speed up the process.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper offers an insight into the research focused on pair and group work activities in EFL classroom settings, specifically repair sequences and the different strategies that the students use to overcome any lexical issues which might prevent them

from continuing their communication. The present analysis reveals the intricacies of dictionary use in conversational repair sequences and the influence that such a language tool might have on the epistemic roles of knowing and unknowing participants in peer interaction. The investigation suggests that during the pair and group work activities the students are exposed to a variety of different interaction patterns and language structures, and that the repair sequences offer an important source of learning opportunities in peer interaction regardless of who the initiator and conductor are. The trouble source is identified by the students as a learnable and turned into a shared pedagogical focus of the interaction for all participants. Despite the fact that only one student searches in the dictionary, the results are made available to the whole group and this facilitates learning opportunities for all of them. Moreover, the analysis indicates that even after consulting a dictionary and, consequently, using the literal L1 translation to negotiate meaning, the students were able to correctly use the trouble source in the context of the activity, which further reveals that they learned something in that specific moment of the interaction. As mentioned earlier, the dictionary was often used as an additional source when other means failed to convey the correct meaning (e.g. Excerpt 3). This suggests that all of the students are engaged in the repair sequence, whether they participate actively by initiating and conducting the repair or passively by listening and validating their colleagues' answers.

The dictionary represents a source of knowledge whose authority was not challenged or problematized in the data. Stone (2019) observes that dictionaries present frozen actions of language experts, suggesting that the student with access to a dictionary serves as the mediator of a language authority. In the present study, even though the roles of knowing and unknowing participants are negotiated throughout the entire interaction, neither the authority nor the correctness of the solution from the dictionary is questioned by the others once it is made public. In Excerpt 2, however, the student does not share her findings with her colleague, which inevitably leads to more confusion than in other instances in the analysis. Despite having recordings from different angles from one or two cameras, the actual finding from the online dictionary was not captured. Not having the video evidence of what the students are truly searching for and looking at in their phones proved to be one of the limitations of this research. In future studies this could be focused on more by trying to incorporate screen recordings and, consequently, digitally mediated interaction, as, for example, in a study by Rusk (2019).

Multiple ways of conducting repair in one sequence may be employed by the students, as shown in the majority of the excerpts here. Given the setting of the interaction and the rules of institutional talk, the learners might try to stick to an English-only policy set by the teacher and only after failing to convey the meaning would they opt for different resources. Nonetheless, as Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003) claim, repair can be viewed as a pedagogical tool and a resource for modified output and input. In the Czech educational context, the research of repair in learner–learner interaction is an under-researched area, not only in language learning environments. Therefore, this study contributes to this field by examining the means of initiating and conducting repair sequences in collaborative activities.

REFERENCES

Barrow, J. (2010). Electronic dictionary look-up practices of novice English learners. In T. Greer (Ed.), *Observing Talk: Conversation Analytic Studies of Second Language Interaction* (pp. 55–72). Pragmatics Special Interest Group of JALT.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E., & Quirk, R. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman.

Dobao, A. F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(1), 40–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.12.002

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3–65). Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 593–611). Blackwell Publishing.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in Conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 370–394). Blackwell Publishing.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in Action. Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices, and Applications*. Cambridge Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 13–31). Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*, 171–212. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000014

Lehti-Eklund, H. (2013). Code-switching to first language in repair — A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *17*(2), 132–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006912441416

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2003). Conversational repair as a role-defining mechanism in classroom interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(3), 375–390. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00196

Majlesi, A. R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *1*(3–4), 193–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.08.004

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation Analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, *7*(2), 183–213. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005522

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, *19*, 349–377. https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001455X

Melander, H. (2012). Transformations of knowledge within a peer group. Knowing and learning in interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *1*(3–4), 232–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.09.003

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 536–550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-17-.x

Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (2011). Conversation analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 165–190). Sage Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446289068.n9

Reichert, T., & Liebscher, G. (2012). Positioning the expert: Word searches, expertise, and

learning opportunities in peer interaction. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*(4), 599–609. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01397.x

Rusk, F. (2019). Digitally mediated interaction as a resource for co-constructing multilingual identities in classrooms. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 21,* 179–193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.03.005

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax* (pp. 261–286). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368897_012

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk* (pp. 71–93). Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective.* Blackwell Publishing.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education, 27*(6), 542–565. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.739174

Sidnell, J. (2013). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 77–99). Blackwell Publishing.

Stone, P. (2019). Repair sequences in 'off-task' conversations in an EFL university classroom in Japan: Japanese language resources and learning opportunities. *Classroom Discourse, 10*(2), 188–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1538886

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208895

Tůma, F., Nepivodová, L., & Fořtová, N. (2019). Výzkum interakce mezi spolužáky: Přehled konverzačněanalytických studií. *Orbis scholae, 13*(2), 1–22.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner.* Longman.

Vaníčková, K. (2014). Transkripce v konverzační analýze. *Studies in Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 48–64.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Wei, L. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society, 31*(2), 159–180. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404501020140

APPENDIX 1

Transcription conventions (adapted from Jefferson, 2004; Vaníčková, 2014)

T	teacher
S	student
Ss	more students speaking
[ ]	overlap
=	immediate reaction to the previous utterance
w<u>ord</u>	stress

OPEN
ACCESS

°word°	a word pronounced more softly
£word£	smiley voice or suppressed laughter
(word)	a dubious word (due to uncertainty on the transcriber's part)
(xxxxx)	an unclear word
((laughs))	commentary
e, ee, eee	hesitation sounds
e, eh, ehm	sounds containing [ə]
hm	one-syllable sound produced with closed mouth
mhm	two-syllable sound produced with closed mouth (affirmation)
ehe	two-syllable sound produced with open mouth (affirmation)
e-e	two-syllable sound made of two separate [ə] sounds produced separately (to express disagreement)
(.)	micro pause
(..)	relatively short pause
(...)	relatively long pause
-	cut-off
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
,	slight rise or fall of intonation
:	stretched sound

Adéla Červenková | Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University
<adela.cervenkova@mail.muni.cz>